



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address : COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

07/866,446 04/10/92 BOYLE

W BWB-100-A

EXAMINER

WILLIAM M. HANLON, JR.
BASILE AND HANLON
1650 WEST BIG BEAVER ROAD, STE. 210
TROY, MI 48064

KOSTAK, V

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3

2602

DATE MAILED:
12/11/92

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

☒ This application has been examined ☐ Responsive to communication filed on _____ ☐ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. ☒ Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. ☒ Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948.
3. ☒ Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1448.
4. ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, Form PTO-162.
5. ☐ Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6. ☐ _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. ☒ Claims 1-10 are pending in the application.

Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.

2. ☐ Claims _____ have been cancelled.

3. ☐ Claims _____ are allowed.

4. ☒ Claims 1, 3, 10 are rejected.

5. ☒ Claims 3-9 are objected to.

6. ☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

7. ☒ This application has been filed with Informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.

8. ☐ Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.

9. ☐ The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable. ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice re Patent Drawing, PTO-948).

10. ☐ The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____ has (have) been ☐ approved by the examiner. ☐ disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

11. ☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____, has been ☐ approved. ☐ disapproved (see explanation).

12. ☐ Acknowledgment is made of the claim for priority under U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has ☐ been received ☐ not been received
☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____

13. ☐ Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

14. ☐ Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

Art Unit 2602

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person.

Claims 1, 2 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Conway et al. in view of Williams (provided by applicant).

Conway (Fig. 10) discloses in his eighth and ninth , embodiments time and video-generated data to be played back with time-position control data, for robot control, as applicant recites.

Although Conway uses memory storage, it would have been obvious to use any suitable storage for such playback, as in Williams, who uses video tape including associated time code data. Such medium is typically used with camera-generated input and would include frame period sequences.

2. Claims 3-9 are allowable over the prior art of record.

Serial No. 866,446

-3-

Art Unit 2602

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor R. Kostak whose telephone number is (703) 305-4374.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4700.

VICTOR R. KOSTAK
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 2602

V. Kostak:st
December 09, 1992

W.R. 6